United Nations A/C.1/49/PV.25

General Assembly
Forty-ninth
First Committee
25th Meeting
Friday, 18 November 1994, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Agenda items 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 71 and 72 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: The Committee will at this meeting proceed to take decisions on the remaining draft resolutions in clusters 1, 5 and 11 — namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.39, A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.17/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2 and A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1.

I shall first call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions on draft resolutions in cluster 1 on which action has already been taken.

Mr. Espinosa (Chile) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I should like to explain Chile's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36.

My delegation believes that this is not the time to request an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. In our opinion, it is difficult to synchronize this request with consideration of the World Health Organization's similar request and with the draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, to be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament, a convention contained in the annex to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31, for which my delegation voted. However, feeling that it should be guided by the majority in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, my delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36.

Mr. Tanaka (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.25/Rev.1 and A/C.1/49/L.36.

Japan, with its unique past experience, honestly desires that the use of nuclear weapons, which would cause unspeakable human suffering, should never be repeated. It thus attaches great importance to the efforts directed towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

The fact that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.25/Rev.1 provides specific measures and time frames for the whole process of nuclear disarmament is worthy of appreciation. But, we understand that, although the proposals contained in the draft resolution are quite detailed, they are not the product of a coordination of the views of the countries concerned, such as the United States, the Russian Federation and other nuclear-weapon States. Japan, which seeks to promote real nuclear disarmament by means of steady disarmament efforts, cannot regard the draft resolution as having been formulated on the basis of appropriate consideration and consultation, and therefore could not support it.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36, Japan considers that, in the present international situation, pursuing the question of the legality of the use of nuclear weapons may simply result in confrontation between countries. Japan therefore believes that it is more appropriate to steadily promote realistic and specific disarmament measures.

Mr. Troug (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: My delegation voted in favour of draft

94-87130 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

resolution A/C.1/49/L.16/Rev.1. However, our affirmative vote certainly does not mean that my country recognizes Israel or that we accept certain elements in the text relating to the peace process in the Middle East.

While we welcome the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region, we draw the attention of the international community to the fact that its aspirations, however noble, can be realized only if the whole world boldly faces up to the Israelis, who possess an enormous arsenal of nuclear weapons, with more than 200 nuclear warheads, not to mention other weapons of mass destruction that they continue to develop. This situation cannot be conducive to realization of the dream of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

We request the international community to take the necessary steps to help destroy Israel's nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The Israelis must also submit their nuclear facilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Only thus can the Middle East become a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Mr. Kim Chang Guk (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.33/Rev.1 because we find that it contradicts the fact that Japan is pursuing nuclear power. Because of Japan's statement, in its official opinion submitted to the International Court of Justice, in compliance with the resolution of the World Health Organization, that the use of nuclear weapons is not in violation of international law, we are very much concerned that Japan may be legally recognizing possession and use of nuclear weapons, which is against its widely propagated three non-nuclear principles. My delegation is worried that the draft resolution could mislead world public opinion, spreading a smokescreen over Japan's nuclear ambition.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to express my delegation's reservations on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.16/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

Our position with respect to the recent agreements and negotiations in the Middle East is quite clear and well known. We do not believe that they will lead to the full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the achievement of justice in the Middle East. For this reason, we have strong reservations on elements of the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4. Those paragraphs prescribe a specific option for realizing peace and security in the region, which runs counter to the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1993.

We are convinced that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in this region at an early date is the most viable way to realize peace and security in the Middle East. This has been Iran's consistent position since 1974, when it initiated a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and introduced what became draft resolution 3263 (XXIX) of 9 December 1974. At present the main obstacle to realization of this initiative is Israel's refusal to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to put its nuclear-weapon programme under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. Therefore, that entity's attempt to introduce irrelevant and extraneous elements into the text of this traditional draft resolution is nothing but an attempt to misrepresent the main purpose of the draft resolution and divert the attention of the international community from its threatening nuclear-weapon programme.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I would like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/49/C.1/L.16/Rev.1.

Israel's attitude with regard to the draft resolution, with its new additions, which was adopted by consensus, was influenced by the fact that it now includes some new, important and positive elements that reflect the changing reality of the Middle East. However, Israel has strong reservations with regard to the modalities contained in the draft resolution.

It remains for me, however, to place on record the Government of Israel's policy on the nuclear issue, which is based on four principles: comprehensiveness, regional framework, a step-by-step approach and the primacy of the peace process.

The first principle is comprehensiveness. The nuclear issue should be dealt with in the full context of the peace process as part of the overall discussions on all regional security problems — conventional and non-conventional.

The second principle concerns a regional framework. Nuclear non-proliferation will be achieved and assured only by establishing the Middle East as a verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The third principle is a step-by-step approach. Practicality dictates that the process be begun with confidence- and security-building measures, establishing relations of peace between all States and reconciliation between all peoples of the region and, in due course, complementing the process by dealing with conventional and non-conventional arms control, with priorities assigned to systems that experience has proved to be destructive and destabilizing.

The fourth principle is the primacy of the peace process. Negotiations on all the issues involved in the security of the region have to take place freely and directly, the way in which they are conducted, in fact, in the bilateral and Arms Control and Regional Sources multilateral talks within the framework of the peace process. Israel strongly supports the concept of establishing the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. This should be freely and directly negotiated between all States of the region and should include for mutual verification arrangements.

Israel feels bound only by those provisions of the present draft resolution that are in accordance with its policy. Israel therefore does not see itself committed to the modalities of this draft resolution in future negotiations, including those of the working group on arms control and regional security. We hope that the consensus reached here, modest though it is, will contribute to the good will and moderation so needed for the crucial effort we all have to invest in the ongoing peace process.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.16/Rev.1, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East." However, we would like to place on record our reservations with regard to the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4, since they do not give prominence to the role that international organizations, such as the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), play in the efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. The failure to mention the participation and support to be extended to such an initiative by international organizations will give some parties in the region the opportunity to continue their bilateral and regional negotiations indefinitely, without achieving any substantive results. They will accordingly avoid any international commitment, foremost among which is adherence to international disarmament treaties.

Mr. Pálsson (Iceland): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.25/Rev.1. The good intentions of its authors notwithstanding, the proposal as a whole presents, in our view, a flawed picture of ongoing efforts in the area of nuclear arms control and disarmament. It also betrays a lack of confidence in the avowed determination of the community of States to bring such efforts to fruition.

While subscribing to the proposal's general objective of reducing the threat posed by nuclear weapons, we question, furthermore, whether the programme of action contained in the proposal is conducive to the eventual attainment of that objective.

In addition, my delegation finds aspects of the proposal ill timed and unrealistic. Attempts to subject important aspects of the arms-control and disarmament agenda to an arbitrary timetable are unhelpful and may even be counterproductive.

For this reason, my delegation was not in a position to support the proposal and abstained in the voting.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.36 and L.33/Rev.1.

First, let me refer to L.36. We are aware of the arguments raised by several States, notably those of the European Union, in relation to this issue. We share some of their concerns, inasmuch as we believe it might have been preferable to await the decision of the International Court of Justice in relation to the request of a similar, though not identical, nature made by the Assembly of the World Health Organization (WHO).

However, we voted in favour of the draft resolution because we do not believe we should deny the rights of an express group of States to have the International Court of Justice give its advisory opinion about a juridical question of evident interest to the international community, a right which is clearly spelt out in Article 96 of the Charter. Brazil does not believe that this measure can harm international efforts towards non-proliferation and disarmament. On the contrary, we call upon all States to look upon this request as a further appeal to redouble efforts in international negotiations, consolidate non-proliferation and lead to the gradual elimination of all nuclear weapons.

I should now like to refer to draft resolution L.33.Rev.1. We are encouraged by the initiative of the delegation of Japan to put forward a draft resolution on "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons." We fully share that delegation's objectives in relation to non-proliferation and disarmament.

We were not able to vote in favour of the draft resolution, however, because we believe its title is not adequately reflected in its contents and because of our well-known position in relation to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Furthermore, the draft resolution makes no reference to other existing instruments, such as the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

Mr. Chandra (India): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.33/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons," which was adopted.

While we are in agreement with the ultimate objective of the draft resolution, notably the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we had hoped that the sponsors would inject an element of urgency into the need to achieve the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. It would also have been desirable to seek early negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for a treaty for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Shorn of those two major elements, the draft resolution is essentially an expression of the need to work towards the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Even with the draft resolution in this emasculated form, we would have gone along with it, as we are supportive of its overall objective, but its call on all States to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) made it impossible for us to do so, as we regard the NPT as inherently flawed and discriminatory and an agreement which has done little to control proliferation and has divided the world into haves and have-nots.

It is against this backdrop that we abstained in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. Hou Zhitong (China) *(interpretation from Chinese)*: The Chinese delegation did not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36. We would like to give the following explanation.

China fully understands the urgent wish on the part of non-nuclear States for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. China has consistently advocated the comprehensive prohibition and complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Since the day it first possessed nuclear weapons, China has solemnly declared that under no circumstances and at no time will we be the first to use them. China has also made a commitment not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons on non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-free zones. We appeal to other nuclear-weapon States to make similar commitments and to negotiate and sign a treaty on the non-use of nuclear weapons against each other. We believe that attaining these objectives will in practice eliminate the possibility of the use or the threat of the use of nuclear weapons.

China hopes that in the further promotion of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war the General Assembly, the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, which have already played an important role, will continue to do so. At the same time, China has consistently supported all the constructive bilateral, regional and multilateral efforts in this regard.

Ms. Duncan (New Zealand): New Zealand would like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.25/Rev.1 entitled "Step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat".

The key operative paragraph recommends that the Conference on Disarmament should in 1995 develop a negotiating programme covering a 5 to 10-year period, involving specific measures of nuclear disarmament, drawing from three sets of proposals set out in operative paragraph 1. The broad objective of this draft resolution — to take advantage of the post-cold war security environment and to set in train a programme of nuclear disarmament negotiations — is consistent with New Zealand's disarmament and arms control goals. We support, in particular, practical measures of nuclear disarmament in the bilateral or multilateral field, such as START I and II, and negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty, a cut-off treaty and security assurances. The programme set out in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.25/Rev.1 encompasses such negotiations.

As currently conceived, however, the programme has shortcomings, we believe. It appears, for example, to task the Conference on Disarmament with certain activities that need to be pursued in other contexts. Moreover, while we will continue to urge that consistent progress be made

towards the goal of nuclear disarmament, including in the context of the 1995 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference, we have reservations about a proposal which suggests that such efforts must be conducted in a time-bound, programmatic way.

However, we welcome the commitment of the sponsors to establish and maintain a dialogue with Member States of the United Nations in the coming months on an item that we agree is of fundamental importance. In the meantime, we hope that concerted efforts in the Conference on Disarmament and elsewhere will continue, in order to conclude negotiations on some of the key measures of nuclear disarmament identified in this draft resolution.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.33/Rev.1, submitted by Japan. We noted with interest this text, whose title refers to the question of nuclear disarmament and the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. This is a question that the international community has been considering as a matter of the highest priority, as was reflected in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament.

However, my delegation must express its regret that under the title of the draft resolution, "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", the text of the operative part refers to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which we feel means that the title and the content are not closely related.

My delegation would have liked the sponsors to promote concrete action aimed at the nuclear-weapon States in stronger terms than the weak request to them to pursue their disarmament efforts. It would have been better, given the good faith exhibited by countries with nuclear weapons in terms of negotiating on the elimination of nuclear weapons, since the entry into force of the NPT almost 25 years ago, during which time the number of nuclear weapons of all kinds has increased considerably, to have emphatically stated the need to fulfil the provisions of article 6 of the Treaty with regard to the elimination within a specific time-frame of such weapons.

Cuba is not a party to the NPT, as the Committee knows. We share the general objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, but we have not acceded to the Treaty, because of, among other things, the difference between the Treaty obligations and duties of countries that do not possess nuclear weapons and those of the nuclear Powers.

My delegation believes that an effective non-proliferation regime, in order to attain its true objective, should first eliminate all nuclear weapons in the hands of the nuclear Powers, within a specific time-frame and with strict international verification. Attaining that objective would be a significant contribution to the chances of other countries' acceding to the Treaty and making it universal.

Those were reasons for our abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.33/Rev.1.

Mr. Tanaka (Japan): I wish to express our deep gratitude and appreciation to all delegations for their support for and understanding of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.33/Rev.1, sponsored by Japan, which was adopted with a large majority of affirmative votes and without a single negative vote.

As I have repeatedly stated in this forum, Japan, with its unique past experience and its desire that the tragedies of the use of nuclear weapons should never be repeated, has been emphasizing the need for the realistic and steady promotion of nuclear disarmament, with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

We believe that the support and understanding given to our draft resolution demonstrates that the aspirations of our people and the policy of our Government in the field of nuclear disarmament are duly recognized in this forum. We sincerely hope that the adoption of this draft resolution will further contribute to the promotion of nuclear disarmament along the path we are pursuing.

Before concluding, I wish to exercise my right of reply to respond to the statement made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on draft resolution L.33/Rev.1. I should like simply to point out that that statement was entirely biased and inappropriate, and contained remarks that are totally groundless.

Mr. Weston (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, since you intend that the Committee should take action on the remaining draft resolutions this afternoon, I should like to ask a question about the budgetary implications, or possible budgetary implications, of two of them: A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2 and A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1. Before my delegation is willing to take action on them, we shall want confirmation from the Secretariat of the budgetary

implications, or at least a statement that there are no budgetary implications.

The Chairman: The statement of the representative of the United Kingdom has duly been taken into account.

I call upon the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, who has asked to make a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. Kim Chang Guk (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I should like to reply to the statement by the representative of Japan.

Since Japan introduced draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.33/Rev.1, we do not understand why its Government does not try to show some sincerity by adopting the three non-nuclear principles as law.

The Chairman: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions to which I referred previously, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to introduce an oral amendment to the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/49/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". The amendment is to include a new operative paragraph 6 after operative paragraph 5. Its text, which is the same as that of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.17, is as follows:

> "*Urges* the Conference on Disarmament to make every effort to reach a solution on the expansion of its membership by the beginning of its 1995 session;".

The remaining paragraphs should be renumbered accordingly.

The new operative paragraph 6 is the result of consultations between interested delegations. We hope that with its addition draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.17/Rev.1 will command a consensus.

Mr. Diall (Mali) (interpretation from French): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", has the following sponsors: Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Togo.

The draft resolution has been the subject of two revisions to reflect the comments and suggestions submitted by certain delegations and agreed to by the sponsors in order to achieve a consensus text.

The second revision, now before the Committee for adoption, states that the circulation of massive quantities of small arms throughout the world impedes development and is a source of increased insecurity. It also mentions that the illicit international transfer of small arms and their accumulation in many countries constitutes a threat to the populations and to national and regional security and is a factor contributing to the destabilization of States.

The draft also mentions the situation of insecurity and banditry linked to the illicit circulation and accumulation of small arms in many countries of the Saharo-Sahelian subregion. Because of the magnitude of this phenomenon and the major risks that it presents to the very stability of the States concerned, these States have appealed for United Nations assistance to support the major efforts they have been making to control it. Without the support of the international community, as we stressed last week when we introduced the draft resolution, they cannot alone face up to this situation. That is why, on behalf of all the sponsors, I repeat our appeal to the Committee for support. We have no doubt that it will be carefully considered and that it will be adopted by consensus.

Finally, I wish to point out that the English text contains a mistake in operative paragraph 4, where the United Nations Centre for Peace and Disarmament is described as the "United Nations Centre for Peace and Democracy".

Mr. Chandra (India): I have been asked by the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement to address draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34.Rev.1, introduced by him earlier, which is entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

Noting that the draft resolution did not command consensus, and recognizing the importance of consensus in the case of such a draft resolution, we, along with many others, have been engaged in consultations with interested delegations.

I am very happy to be able to report that we have been able to arrive at an agreement with interested delegations on language which we expect will enjoy consensus. I should like to thank all concerned for this.

The changes which this agreement entails in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34.Rev.1 are as follows. Operative paragraph 1 has been modified to read:

> "*Decides* in principle to convene, in 1997 if possible, the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the date to be considered at its fiftieth regular session;".

Operative paragraph 2 is to be deleted, and paragraph 3 is to be renumbered as paragraph 2.

In the context of what I have just said, we would request that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1, as orally amended, be adopted by consensus without a vote.

In conclusion, I should like to mention that it is our understanding that this consensus would render redundant the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/49/L.52.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): On behalf of the co-sponsors of document A/C.1/49/L.52, I can state that we are willing that no action should be taken on it, on the understanding that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1, as orally amended by the representative of India, be put to the vote with no further amendment. We would like to express our appreciation for the cooperation and flexibility displayed by various representatives of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1.

Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I wish to refer to the sub-item entitled "Transparency in armaments". A number of delegations submitted draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18, and another group submitted amendments to it, which are contained in document A/C.1/49/L.45.

Consultations have been held between the two groups in recent weeks. On behalf of the co-sponsors of document A/C.1/49/L.45, I should like to thank the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18 for the changes they have made in their text, which are reflected in document A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1. Because of the nature of these changes, we will not insist on a vote on the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/49/L.45. However, so that our respective positions may appear on the record, we would request that a recorded vote be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, and that a separate vote be taken first on operative paragraphs 4 (b) and 6.

On behalf of the delegations of Indonesia and Mexico, I should like now to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1.

Through resolution 46/36 L of 1991, the Register of Conventional Arms was established, thus beginning an exercise which also included the nomination of a group of experts by the Secretary-General and consideration of the item by the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

At the beginning of 1992 we urged that time should be allowed for the Register to evolve and that, accordingly, the work done in the group of experts and in the Conference on Disarmament should adjust to a fixed timetable — in other words, there should be no attempt to make this item a fixture on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. The results achieved thus far in these forums are not very encouraging, and reveal the need to allow the Register to continue operating for a few more years before new groups of experts are set up, or before diverting the attention of the Conference on Disarmament, which is considering in depth a number of priority issues. That would be unfortunate.

For these reasons, the delegations of Indonesia and Mexico will abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 4 (b). We will vote against operative paragraph 6, and we will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1 as a whole.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", will cast a negative vote on operative paragraph 4 (b), and will abstain on operative paragraph 6, for the following reasons.

First, operative paragraph 4 (b) recommends that a group of governmental experts be convened in 1997. Secondly, in operative paragraph 6, the draft resolution invites the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work on transparency in armaments. These recommendations are being made despite the fact that the group of governmental experts and the Conference on Disarmament did not register any progress in their consideration of this issue in 1994. Moreover, we do not see any rationale behind these recommendations at a time when there is no political will among nuclear-weapon States to expand the Register of Conventional Arms to include data and information on all types of conventional weapons, as well as weapons of mass destruction, and at a time when the United Nations is operating under financial constraints.

The amendments contained in document A/C.1/49/L.45, sponsored by Algeria, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria and Sri Lanka, are aimed at addressing these issues.

However, the reservations of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, and the ideas contained in A/C.1/49/L.45, are not aimed at the importance of the continuation of the Register of Conventional Arms as it is. My delegation attaches great importance to transparency in armaments, and it has consistently supported this initiative in the United Nations and elsewhere. We submitted our reports recently, and will continue to do so. However, we see no need to reconvene the group of governmental experts, and we call upon the Conference on Disarmament to consider this issue for the reasons that I have explained.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I wish to point out a number of facts about draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.39 in order to dissipate any misunderstandings. The draft resolution does not create any new obligations, but draws exclusively from those to be derived from the Treaty of Tlatelolco and a treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa. It does not seek to establish a new nuclear-weapon-free zone, nor does it request negotiations to that end. The area affected by the draft resolution is the one covered by the Treaty of Tlatelolco and a treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

The draft resolution affects the high seas only inasmuch as the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa do so, and in line with the approach of other treaties, such as the Treaty of Rarotonga and the Antarctic Treaty do — that is, in full conformity with the law of the sea and with the freedom of navigation on the high seas. The text of the fourth preambular paragraph is drawn directly from Articles 87 and 88 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, which entered into force two days ago. Article 88 states:

> "The high seas shall be reserved for peaceful purposes."

The endorsement in operative paragraph 4 is of

> "the objective of the States of the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic",

which will come about as result of the entry into force of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

The draft resolution is a reflection of the commitment of the co-sponsors to non-proliferation and of the aspiration of the international community to this same objective.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: We shall now move on to explanations of vote before the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.39, A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.17/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2 and A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1.

Mr. Shoukry (Egypt): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L in 1991, which established the Register of Conventional Arms, Egypt has contributed faithfully to advocating the principle of transparency in military matters. Egypt has been supportive of the objectives underlying the establishment of the Register.

For the Register to attain its objectives as a truly significant confidence-building measure, capable of eliminating suspicions and misperceptions, and thereby contributing to enhancing security and stability, in our view it must be based on the following requirements: it must be a universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory confidence-building measure; it must ensure equal rights and obligations for all States; it must address the legitimate security concerns of all States; and it must provide the broadest degree of transparency in all fields of armaments in a non-selective manner.

The modest initial steps to establish the Register in 1991 were recognized and accepted as a practical necessity. The evolutionary nature of this mechanism was abundantly clear from resolution 46/36 L. It was also clear that there was a prescribed time-frame for such evolution to be completed, that being the work of the 1994 group of experts mandated to undertake this task.

The delegation of Egypt is disappointed by the outcome of the work of the group of experts in 1994. The group was unable to reach any agreement on related aspects of the further development of the Register. Even though various worthy proposals were presented to enable the Register to emerge as a truly effective confidence-building measure, they all fell prey to obstinate insistence on maintaining the status quo unchanged.

There was no agreement to further develop the scope of the Register, by means of adjusting the definitions of the

existing seven categories of conventional arms to be reported to the Register, even for the sake of clarity. There was opposition to the proposal to include in the reporting system, within the established seven categories of conventional arms, the description of such arms as an integral component of the reporting system so as to provide effective and non-discriminatory transparency.

Much to our disappointment, there was no agreement to extend the scope of the Register to include information on existing stockpiles and indigenous production capabilities in the existing categories of conventional arms. There was adamant opposition to any possibility of incorporating in the Register, at any time, weapons of mass destruction.

Despite the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1 is entitled "Transparency in armaments", it is abundantly clear that all we are left with is not even a Register of conventional arms, but merely a Register of selective and limited conventional arms transfers. That is precisely what we thought had been avoided in 1991, when a revised text of what was then also draft resolution L.18 had been produced. The final formulation of resolution 46/36 L alleviated the fear that the issue of transparency would be addressed in a selective manner to accommodate the security concerns of only a few. Unfortunately, events have proved otherwise.

From the outcome of the work of the expert group in 1994, and from the direction of the text of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, it seems only fair to conclude that the main objective of this exercise is simply to consolidate this clearly discriminatory mechanism as what it truly is — merely a Register of limited conventional arms transfers.

We are unimpressed by the prospect of the possible eventual development of the Register in terms of expansion of its scope. Such a prospect seems remote, in view of the apparent lack of political will on the part of the international community to faithfully embrace the principles and objectives of transparency or apply them in a comprehensive, non-discriminatory and equitable manner.

For its part, Egypt is neither willing nor able to continue to associate itself with this ineffective mechanism, which, in its present form, is detrimental to our national security.

At the same time we must reiterate that what the General Assembly advocated in 1991 was a policy of transparency in armaments. We firmly support that lofty objective. We believe it can contribute to international peace and security, and will continue to work towards the achievement of this goal.

For these reasons, my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1.

Mr. Fouathia (Algeria) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Algeria, which attaches great importance to the question of transparency in armaments, has always supported initiatives that seek to promote genuine transparency. We are interested in anything that might help to attain that goal, particularly the establishment of systems that are capable of guaranteeing transparency, are viable and are supported by all States.

My delegation has supported similar initiatives at previous sessions. Despite its imperfections, which we pointed out at the time, we voted in favour of resolution 46/36 L.

We joined the consensus on the question of transparency that later emerged, but we will not be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, for a number of reasons, which are on the whole reflected in document A/C.1/49/L.45. We would have preferred to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1 to be able to respond favourably to our concerns, so as to preserve the consensus on this matter.

The draft before us today endorses the efforts made thus far. We do not support that, nor do we think we should continue to deal with the matter in the current manner, particularly in frameworks which have shown a limited ability to take into account the wishes of a large number of States. Therefore, we cannot go on supporting initiatives that do not give a new impetus to efforts to establish a viable, effective and complete system to promote genuine transparency in the military area.

We note with regret that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1 continues to highlight efforts that have not produced the desired results. Therefore, my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, abstain on operative paragraph 4 (b) and vote against operative paragraph 6.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

My delegation was among the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/49/L.45, which was presented with the purpose of amending draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18. My delegation has noted with appreciation the efforts of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18 in amending their draft, as reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1. Although the amendments incorporated into that document do not fully satisfy our expectations, we have noted the improvements made in operative paragraphs 4 and 6, which demonstrate the desire of the sponsors to compromise and accommodate, to the extent possible, the views of the sponsors of document A/C.1/49/L.45.

In view of this, my delegation has joined the decision of the sponsors of A/C.1/49/L.45 to withdraw their amendments, as a demonstration of our goodwill. This was not an easy decision, and the only compromise possible was to request separate votes which would enable the sponsors to vote according to their own positions.

As the amendments do not fully correspond with our position, Sri Lanka will abstain in the separate votes taken on operative paragraphs 4 (b) and 6, as well as on the draft resolution as a whole.

Finally, let me assure the Committee that we attach importance to transparency and that our vote should not be misunderstood as an attempt to belittle transparency. Our position on the subject of transparency in armaments has been fully reflected in the documents released by the members of the Group of 21 in Geneva.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.39.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.39, entitled "The South Atlantic region as a nuclear-weapon-free zone", was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 7 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Angola, Argentina, Benin, Brazil, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Monaco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Canada, Italy

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.39 was adopted by 140 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 4 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, China, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland

Paragraph 4 (b) was retained by 114 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on paragraph 6.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland,

Sweden, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Algeria, Cuba, Indonesia, Mexico

Abstaining:

Angola, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan

Paragraph 6 was retained by 117 votes to 4, with 15 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.17/Rev.1, as orally amended by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.17/Rev.1, as orally amended by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a draft resolution which has programme budget implications, as contained in document A/C.1/49/L.51, was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 9 November 1994, and is sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Chairman: The sponsor of this draft resolution has expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.17/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", was introduced by the representative of Mali at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 9 November 1994, and is sponsored by the following countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Côte

d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Togo.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2, I would like to read the following statement on behalf of the Secretariat into the record:

> "By draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2, the General Assembly would, *inter alia*, encourage the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to curb the illicit circulation of small arms and to ensure their collection in the affected States which so request, with the support of the United Nations Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa and in close cooperation with the Organization of African Unity. In this connection, the Secretary-General does not anticipate at this time that implementation of the draft resolution to ensure the collection of illicit small arms circulated in the affected States would have financial implications for the 1994-1995 regular budget of the United Nations."

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chairman: We will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1, as orally amended by the representative of India.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 9 November 1994, and is sponsored by Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution, as orally amended by the representative of India, be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position after the vote or decision on the draft resolutions.

Mr. Weston (United Kingdom): My delegation was glad to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.2, which the Committee has just adopted, on assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them.

As we have made clear to the sponsors, it is the United Kingdom's view that any costs associated with the implementation of this draft resolution, and in particular with the United Nations Consultative Mission, should continue to be met from within existing resources and should not place any additional burden on the United Nations regular budget. It is in this light that we view the language in operative paragraph 4. We therefore welcome the statement just made by the Secretary of the Committee, which makes it clear that the recommendations in this draft resolution will not impose any new financial burden on the United Nations budget.

In addition, although the United Kingdom recognizes the good intentions behind the political initiative undertaken by the sponsors of this draft resolution, we believe that the focus should be maintained clearly on the illicit traffic in small arms.

We therefore find the language in the second preambular paragraph inconsistent with the rest of the draft resolution. Small arms can be essential weapons of self-defence for any nation, and their possession, *per se*, does not necessarily impede development or increase insecurity. It is not massive, but excessive, quantities which can be destabilizing. Illicit transfers, on the other hand, can pose a threat to the stability of the State or region.

We would hope, therefore, that the sponsors of draft resolution recognize this concern and will make efforts to clarify this important point if they wish to put forward a similar draft resolution next year.

Mr. Kim Chang Guk (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation has reservations about draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, "Transparency in armaments" for the following reasons: transparency is not always conducive to confidence-building and disarmament, and the Register may, rather, serve the arms trade and the

arms race. Arms transfers reflects the uncertainty of security in a region, and arms selling is taken for granted as a sort of commercial trade for profit. Arms buying is recognized as the exercise of the sovereign right to national security.

Therefore, we do not understand the value of transparency through the use of a Register when the causes of insecurity remain unresolved. At the same time, the Register does not include weapons deployed on territories other than one's own. We think that weapons deployed on the territories of other nations should be taken as a form of arms transfer, which should be withdrawn for the sake of confidence and disarmament.

Mr. Chaouachi (Tunisia) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, as we voted in favour of paragraphs 4(b) and 6. We wish to stress the importance we attach to the promotion in military matters of a non-discriminatory and universally recognized transparency able to gain the support of the greatest possible number of Member States. My delegation therefore understands and supports the need to expand the Register of Conventional Arms to other categories of matériel and weapons, including weapons of mass destruction.

My delegation hopes that progress will be possible in expanding the Register so as to increase its effectiveness and credibility.

Mr. Tayeb (Saudi Arabia) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I wish to explain the position of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1.

We abstained in the voting on the draft resolution because we support general and complete disarmament. Although in principle we favour transparency in armaments as a confidence-building measure, we are aware that in order to attain that noble goal we must recognize that the establishment of an international security environment should be based on the principles of non-selectivity and balance. Transparency cannot create security and peace unless it is based on those principles.

Accordingly, we believe that the draft resolution is incompatible with that goal, since transparency does not take into consideration the national production of weapons. This is a very important question, for several countries rely on their own domestic arms production. Nor does the draft resolution deal sufficiently with the question of weapons of mass destruction, although such weapons constitute the most serious threat to international peace and security.

I would reiterate that my country continues to favour transparency in armaments.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, "Transparency in armaments."

Israel was among the first countries to support resolution 46/36 L, which set up the Register of Conventional Arms, as well one of the first to report in accordance with the terms of that resolution. The Register is certainly important as the beginning of a long process aimed at the implementation of global confidence-building measures. It has, however, to stand up to the test of time, and the principle of stability should be retained. The existing categories of the Register should be consolidated before further major changes are considered. Proceeding too fast is likely to impede the fundamental goals of the Register, and, instead of building mutual confidence, might give rise to security concerns.

We believe that additional countries from our region should join the Register. Also, the establishment of confidence-building measures in the regional framework of the Arms Control and Regional Security Working Group will significantly improve confidence and transparency in our region.

Mr. Errera (France) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.39, "The South Atlantic region as a nuclear-weapon-free zone". We voted against the draft resolution. We cannot support an initiative with too many ambiguities. The first concerns the impact of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Atlantic, a region that is mainly ocean. Secondly, there is the effect on high-seas navigation. The drafting of the text of the draft resolution is imprecise in this regard, and therefore we cannot support it.

In addition, the delimitation of the proposed zone is not clear. If it is to consist of areas already covered by the Treaty of Tlatelolco or the future treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, why not say so? Lastly, we do not see why we should be asked to formally endorse an initiative that is still in the design stages.

For all those reasons, my delegation voted against the draft resolution. We did so with regret, because in the past

week we have constantly sought with the co-sponsors ways to arrive at an amended text that would enjoy consensus. Unfortunately, that was not possible; we regret it, because it is inconsistent with the spirit of dialogue and compromise shown by other delegations on subjects that are considerably more sensitive and difficult. We particularly regret it since France, as is well known, supports the objectives of the Treaty of Tlatelolco as well as the efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like briefly to express its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, concerning transparency in armaments.

The Register of Conventional Arms was established pursuant to resolution 46/36 L, which provides that the Register should be extended to cover the question of weapons of mass destruction. As we all know, the group of experts established under resolution 46/36 L, which concluded its work last summer, was unable to reach conclusions on fundamental issues within its mandate, such as expanding that mandate and including weapons of mass destruction. The reports submitted by the Secretary-General on this issue show my delegation that, despite the great efforts made, the Register clearly still lacks universality and by no means all Member States of this Organization are participating in this confidence-building measure. Therefore, we believe that it would be premature to take a decision now to establish a new group of experts for 1997 to consider the expansion of the Register.

Similarly, the results of the consideration of this issue in the Conference on Disarmament, which also failed to reach agreement, also reveals substantial differences between delegations on their approach to the question of transparency in armaments. This indicates that the time is not ripe for the continuation of the exercise we have begun, and our delegation believes that there would be no point in the matter's being dealt with anew in the Conference on Disarmament, which has very important and urgent negotiations to carry out, such as those on the total prohibition of nuclear tests.

My delegation therefore believes that we should wait for the political climate to change in such a way as to make possible a unified position on the form and content of the Register. This explains our vote on operative paragraphs 4 (b) and 6, and why we abstained on the text as a whole.

Mr. Troug (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My country's delegation would like to explain our position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, on which we abstained, for the following reasons.

First, the Register of Conventional Arms does not cover nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. At a time when we are calling for our concerns to be taken into account, which means the submission of full information on the production of weapons of mass destruction, we believe that confidence-building measures cannot be achieved without this.

We belong to a very sensitive region, where there are many weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons; as the Committee is aware, the Israelis possess huge nuclear armaments and other weapons. Therefore, transparency will not be achieved without a full record of all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. If the supporters of the draft resolution are sincere, they, including the Israelis, will have to submit a full account of the stockpiles of all the weapons they possess.

Mr. Obadi (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1.

We did not participate in the voting process, despite the fact that we used to support this draft resolution and were among those that established the Register. We believe that it contributes to confidence-building measures, but this year we find that the draft resolution did not take a comprehensive approach to the question of transparency. That is why we did not participate in the voting this year.

Mr. Eltinay (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1.

We abstained in the vote on paragraph 4 (b) and paragraph 6 and on the draft resolution as a whole. Our position may be summarized as follows.

The draft resolution requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of experts, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register of Conventional Arms and its further development, without giving due attention to the repeated call for the Register also to cover weapons of mass destruction. The transparency required for regional confidence-building measures cannot be achieved unless this Register covers all kinds of weapons. The information required for the Register at present does not make possible the attainment of

the Register's objectives. Weapons are flowing to hotbeds of tension and regions of conflict without being registered and without the authorities' being notified of that flow.

Accordingly, we believe that the Register should be comprehensive and non-discriminatory, and that countries of every region should supply all the information required for it to be transparent, without focusing on a particular type of weapon, as there is total ambiguity regarding the weapons possessed by certain States.

The Chairman: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of all disarmament and international security agenda items: items 53 to 66, 68 to 73 and 153.

(spoke in Spanish)

I should like to take this opportunity to thank and congratulate all delegations for the spirit of cooperation, tolerance and understanding that they have displayed in our discussions and in taking decisions on these items.

I also wish to thank the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, the Secretary of the Committee and the staff of the Secretariat, who joined us in our work. Special thanks also go to the interpreters and the staff of the Department of Public Information. I hope that the same spirit will prevail in our work next week.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.